

**III. REMARKS**

1. Claims 1-16 are pending.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-16 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Wu, U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0165465. Claim 1 recites a "bendable keymat" having "elastic properties that force the lips into the plurality of indentations on the cover to attach the edges of the keymat to the cover". This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Wu.

Wu discloses a two module keyboard with a splash resistant mechanism. The keyboard has a key module that can be separated by a user from a base module (Abstract). The base module is disclosed as being the system unit of a notebook/laptop computer or the system unit of a desktop computer, excluding the display monitor (Para. 0047). The components of the keyboard (10) include a top key-holding plate (14) for supporting multiple keycaps (15), a key actuating mechanism (16) in a resilient retaining sheet formed with upward domes for biasing the keycaps at a raised level, the PCB (13), a bottom holding plate (17) and upper and lower enclosure halves (18, 19) that allow the key actuating mechanism (16) to be connected to the keycaps (15) of the key module (12) (Para. 0071). The upper enclosure (18) in Wu, corresponding to the hard plastic casing of a keyboard for a traditional desktop computer, may be grouped into the base module (11) or a key module (812) (Para. 0072). The key module (12) has tabs (25) at its four sides, which can be snapped into grooves (26) on the inside rim (27) of the key bay. When the key module (12) is introduced into the base module (11) the four side tabs (25) are resiliently flexed away from the rim (27) of the base module (11) and immediately return to their normal positions and then snap into the grooves (26) to secure the two modules (11, 12) to each other. (Para. 0076; Fig. 3). In other embodiments the key module is held on the base module with a latch hinge mechanism (Fig. 8, Para. 0084), with screws (725a-c) (Fig. 11; Para. 0090), with tab like hooks (825) (Fig. 12; Para. 0092), with rigid tabs (925) and sliding lock pins (927) (Fig. 13, Para. 0093) and with tabs (1025) and hooks (1026) that are slidably engaged



(Fig. 14; Para. 0094). Nowhere does Wu disclose that the key module (12) is “a bendable keymat” having “elastic properties that force the lips into the plurality of indentations on the cover to attach the edges of the keymat to the cover” as recite in Applicant’s claim 1.

In Wu the key module (12) is rigid and not bendable as evidenced by the methods of attachment disclosed in Wu. For example, in Wu resilient tabs (25) are needed so that the rigid key module (12) can be attached to the base module (11) (See e.g. Fig. 3). Further, evidence of the rigidity of the key module (11) can be seen in Figures 5, 11, 13 and 14 of Wu. With respect to Figure 5, separate key modules (212-215) are attached to individual portions of a foldable base module. It is clear from Figure 5 that each sub-module (212-215) is rigid as the sub-modules do not span the folds and remain straight when the base module is folded. With respect to Figure 11, the rigid key module sections (712a, 712b) are screwed to the base module (711). As can be seen in Figure 13 of Wu, the key module (912) is held in place by a tab (925) and slider (927) arrangement. In Figure 14, the key module (1012) is attached to the base module (1011) by tabs (1025) and hooks (1026) that are slidably engaged. All of these methods of attachment between the key module and base module are configured so that the key portion of the key module is not bent when installed or affixed to the base module.

Thus, claim 1 not anticipated by Wu and is patentable because Wu fails to disclose or suggest at least that the bendable keymat comprises elastic properties that force the lips into the plurality of indentations on the cover to attach the edges of the keymat to the cover.

Applicant’s claim 1 further recites that the cover “includes a plurality of apertures through which the plurality of pressure transmitters pass to activate the plurality of key switches”. The only cover with holes (i.e. top holding plate (5)) disclosed in Wu is shown in Figure 2 and described in paragraph [0023] as holding down the key actuating



mechanism (6) and protecting the components beneath. The pressure transmitters of the keycaps (1) do not pass through the holes in the top holding plate (5) as the holding plate (5) sits directly on top of the key actuating mechanism (6) so that the rubber domes (7) of the key actuating mechanism protrude through the holes. In addition, holes in the cover of Wu would go against the water tight properties of the keyboard (see Para. 0075). Thus, claim 1 is patentable for the additional reason that Wu does not disclose or suggest the cover "includes a plurality of apertures through which the plurality of pressure transmitters pass to activate the plurality of key switches".

Claims 6 and 11 are patentable over Wu for reasons that are substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 14-16 are patentable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

3. Claims 3, 8 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Wu and Kfoury et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0119543 ("Kfoury"). Claims 3, 8 and 13 depend from claims 1, 6 and 11 which are patentable over Wu for the reasons described above. It is submitted that because Wu does not disclose or suggest all the features of claims 1, 6 and 11, that the combination of Wu and Kfoury cannot as well. Thus, claims 3, 8 and 13 are patentable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no legal motivation to combine Wu with Kfoury. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. There must also be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (See M.P.E.P. § 2142). As noted above, the combination of Wu and Kfoury does not disclose or suggest each feature of Applicant's claims. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established.



Neither Wu nor Kfoury provide any suggestion or motivation to be combined or modified as proposed by the Examiner and the Examiner's proposition that Applicant's invention would be obvious as recited in the claims is not supported by the factual contents of Wu or Kfoury.

Wu is directed to splash resistant full sized keyboards for desktop or laptop computers (See Abstract).

Kfoury on the other hand is directed to an input module for reduced size portable communication devices where the input module has two input devices, one on each side of the input module (See Abstract).

One skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the full sized keyboards of Wu with the reduced size input module of Kfoury to achieve what is claimed in Applicant's claims. If Wu and Kfoury were combined the result would be nothing more than the full sized keyboard of Wu where the key module (11) has one of the input devices of Kfoury located on one side of the key module (11) and the other input device of Kfoury located on the other side of the key module (11).

When "the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such a teaching or suggestion appears in the reference". In re Rijckaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner is requested to provide an indication as to where any such teaching, suggestion or motivation appears in the reference. Absent such a teaching, it is submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Wu and Kfoury under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is not established.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the




10/788,427

Response to Office Action mailed March 9, 2007

Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



Geza G. Ziegler, Jr.

Reg. No. 44,004

30 May 2007  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

### **CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically on the date indicated below and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 31 May 2007

Signature: Natalie Ivanoff

Natalie Ivanoff  
Person Making Deposit